it. It will be then an endless affair. Supposing on March 29, the Appropriation Bill comes up here, and in exercise of the right to speak, we go on speaking till April 1, what will happen? There must be some reason. Therefore, we have to follow the convention and tradition here.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall follow the tradition here. The question is—

'That the Madras Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 21 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be passed.'

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I may inform hon. Members that the House will sit today till 5 p.m.

(3) THE MADRAS BUILDINGS (LEASE AND RENT CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL, 1965 (L.A. BILL NO. 23 OF 1965.)

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I move—

"That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, [a] 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 23 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration."

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved—

"That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 23 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration."

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Bill has not come a day too soon. It must have been brought before the House long ago. I am happy however that the Madras Government have brought in this Bill recognising the need for it at least now. So far they have recognised only the allopaethic system of medicine. Now, under the revised Bill, practitioners of other systems of medicine, such as Homoeopathy and Ayurveda are also to be recognised . . .

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Bill that I have just now moved relates to Rent Control. The other Bill will come up later.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : I am sorry, Sir.

*SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Bill has come before the House for extension of the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act for a further term. This was first brought in as an emergent measure to see that Government servants and others got suitable accommodation at reasonable rents. I do not see any reason why the term of this legislation should be extended by two years, five years, and so on. For one 4-30 p.m.

---

a Printed as Appendix III on page 47.

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthy] [11th August 1965

thing the Government have not been able to provide their servants with necessary quarters during the period this Act has been in force. I wonder when they are going to provide quarters for their servants. They are not able to do this even with so many housing schemes and other special schemes. That is why they are continuing this measure which affects considerably a very large number of people. All the houses in this City and important towns in the State fetching a rent of over Rs. 25 were brought under this measure. There are various types of house-owners, who are hard hit by this measure. In this City itself, we can find a spacious house on a rent of Rs. 60 because it is under the accommodation control. A similar house next door, which is not under the accommodation control, earns a rent of Rs. 250. What sin has the owner of the first house committed that he should get not even 1/4th of the rent which his neighbour gets? Is it because his house is under accommodation control that he should suffer this hardship? We have given exemption under the Act for certain buildings constructed after a particular year. We have also said that if the owner lives in a portion of the house, the rest of the portion he can rent out at fabulous rates, without coming under the control. Then again, if the rent is over Rs. 250, such houses also will not come under the accommodation control provisions. Therefore, the tendency of many house owners and moneyed people in the city is to build a small house with mosaic flooring with the latest amenities, on western style, and say that the rent is Rs. 300, because such houses cannot come under control. So this measure has not solved the problem. On the other hand it has increased the rents. The tendency of the people is to raise the rent beyond Rs. 250, because the limit indicated by Accommodation Control Act is Rs. 250. Even though there are provisions for fixing fair rent and other things, the measure has not solved the problem. What sin the people who built houses two years ago have committed in order to deserve only a rent of Rs. 25, whereas a similar house, constructed after the said period, fetches a rent of more than Rs. 250? So, something should be done in respect of these house-owners who put up their houses some two decades ago. There are widows who are mainly dependent on this income. There are also orphans who depend only on house rent. What relief the Government think of giving to those people who eke out their livelihood only from the rent they got whenever they extend the term of the Act? Anybody can go and investigate and find for himself that while a house under control gets only a rent of Rs. 60 to Rs. 70, the same house, out of control, fetches a rent of more than Rs. 300 in the same locality. Sir, this Government brought in a taxation measure on urban lands. The basis of valuation adopted there for purposes of levying the tax is the latest value of the property in the locality. Cannot that criterion be applied here also as we see in the same locality one house under control getting a rent of Rs. 30 only and another out of control getting a rent of more than Rs. 60 and over? A large number of people have been complaining to me year in and year out that this control must go or the Government must enable

11th August 1965] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

them to get the same rent that is prevalent in the locality for houses not under control. The more we extend this Act, the more will we be extending the hardship of our people who built their houses two decades ago. People who build houses in the cities now by selling their lands in villages and those who build on improved pattern to rent their houses for over Rs. 250 do not come under the control. The ordinary people find it difficult to get accommodation. These are the difficulties perpetuated by the extension of the life of this measure.

The most important point is that house owners, whose houses come under the accommodation control, must be given some relief by way of enabling them to get reasonable rent that is prevalent in the locality. That is my point, Sir.

* THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do realise all the points raised by the hon. Member Sri Krishnamoorthy. But at the time, when the Act was brought into force, the Government did not feel that it would be so difficult for the Government servants to find accommodation. As it is, at the moment, the newly built houses from the year 1960 onwards, have been exempted from the Act. At the beginning it was decided that the principal Act should be in force for a period of five years. The Joint Select Committee which went into the provisions of the original Act felt that it would be rather difficult and instil fear in the minds of the people that this control measure may be made a permanent measure. Therefore, the Joint Select Committee recommended that in the first instance the measure might be recommended for three years. But since then, the situation does not seem to have improved, and on the other hand, more difficulties have arisen. And therefore the Government feel that the life of the Act should be extended for a further period from 5 to 10 years. The life of the Act expires on the 30th September 1965 and we are obliged to find proper accommodation for our Government servants. Therefore, I request the House to accept the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

"That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 23 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration."

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 1, the long title and the Enacting Formula were put and carried.

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I move—

"That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 23 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be passed."

[11th August 1965

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

"That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 23 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be passed."

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

4-40 p.m.

(4) THE MADRAS DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965 (L.A. BILL NO. 15 OF 1965.)

* THE HON. SRI S. M. A. MAJID : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I move—

"That the Madras District Development Councils (Amendment) Bill,[a] 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 15 of 1965), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration."

According to sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Madras District Development Councils Act, 1958 (Madras Act XVIII of 1958), not more than three months shall elapse between one meeting of the District Development Council and another. Taking this into account and in order to secure the efficient transaction of business by the District Development Councils, instructions have been issued by the Government that the meetings of the District Development Councils should be held in the alternate months of February, April, June, August, October and December every year. In accordance with the above instructions, the District Development Council meetings are normally held once in two months, that is well within the time-limit specified in sub-section (1) of Section 6. But there are instances where the District Development Council meetings could not be held once in every three months. In East Ramanathapuram, the District Development Council meeting to be held in December 1964 had to be postponed due to the cyclonic conditions then prevailing in the district. Further the term of office of the Chairman of Panchayat Union Councils (who form the bulk of the members of the District Development Councils) expired on the 2nd February 1965 and the new Chairmen of Panchayat Union councils assumed office only in April 1965. Hence the meetings of the District Development Councils which should have been held during the months of February and April in the current year could not be held. It may be contended that since more than three months elapsed between two meetings of the District Development Councils, the subsequent acts and proceedings of the councils are not valid in view of the express provisions contained in sub-section (1) of section 6. Such a contention may not have much force since the requirement regarding time-limit specified in the said sub-section is only directory and not mandatory. If so, the acts and proceedings of the District Development Councils, which held meetings at intervals of more than three months, will not be rendered invalid. However, in order to place the matter beyond controversy, it is proposed to amend section 7 of the Act to provide

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on pages 47-48.